

REMARKS

Claims 2, 7, and 12 have been canceled. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, and 14-30, and amended claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11, and 13 are in this application.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, and 15-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Panasonic.

Amended independent claim 1 recites in part the following:

"in which a respective representation of a respective program is displayable in a fourth color which is different from said first, second, and third colors when the cursor is located thereat and prior to a selection of the respective program by the means for enabling." (Emphasis added.)

It is respectfully submitted that the portions of Panasonic relied on by the Examiner in explaining the above 102 rejection of claim 1 do not appear to specifically disclose the above features of claim 1. For example, in explaining in the above 102 rejection with regard to claim 2, the Examiner appears to assert that at least some of the above features of claim 1 are disclosed on page 25 of Panasonic in the section entitled "Recording a Single Upcoming Show 2" by the use of "a solid red dot." (See lines 18-22 of page 4 of the present Office Action.) However, such portion of Panasonic does not disclose "in which a respective representation of a respective program is displayable in a fourth color . . . when the cursor is located thereat and prior to a selection of the respective program by the means for enabling," as in claim 1. In fact, such portion of Panasonic appears to indicate that the red dot is only placed next to the show after it is selected for recording. Accordingly, it is

respectfully submitted that claim 1 as presented herein is distinguishable from Panasonic as applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that independent claims 6 and 11 as presented herein are distinguishable from Panasonic as applied by the Examiner.

Claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, and 15-30 are dependent from one of the independent claims and, as such, are also distinguishable from Panasonic as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claims 4, 9, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Panasonic in view of Lemmons.


Claims 4, 9, and 14 are dependent from one of the independent claims and are also distinguishable from Panasonic as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons discussed above. The Examiner does not appear to have relied upon Lemmons to overcome the above described deficiencies of Panasonic. As such, claims 4, 9, and 14 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Panasonic and Lemmons.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections and/or rejections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

757743_1.DOC